XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
WA6-2034

HARVEY
Aluminum Sales Inc.

REPLY TO DISTRICT OFFICE

20734

2/12.66

Dear Mrs. Meagher,

Hastily, I wrote Oscar Collier this morning telling him of our phone conversation and also telling him if he saw fit to give you the copy of my book that he has. If for any reason he cannot (for I hope he is considering it) let me know. I got one back today and expect to pick another up on Monday

It was kind of you to call. I shudder to think of the phone bill. I wish I could afford them. My infrequent recent trips to New York have been a burden for we began broke and are now deep in debt. I do expect to be in New York sometime in the near future, but there is a problem I think I can solve. The friend with whom I ordinarily stay is in Europe, and I am reluctant to be at his home overnight in the chichi, individual-residential area of Long Island, when the neighbors know he is not there. So many are the kind of people who would think ill of his wife. But usually I can improvise something that doesn't require a hotel bill. I did spend one night in my car and am nonethe worse for it.

I have just heard that the other house is still serious about my book and is having an additional reading, for what purpose I do not know. From a hint I am led to believe someone may have spoken to them about Mark Lane's. They see "quality" in mine.

To give you an idea of what an author in this field faces, I had a letter three days ago from the executive editor of the house from which the copy returned today. There were, he said, "serious legal problems". In the margin the lawyer or whoever went over it after the excitedly favorable editorial recommendation marked such things as "had the Commission said less then it did about the Dallas police, every nose in the country would have wrinkled"; that Marina was a self-confessed liar (which was immediately followed by the exact quotation; that Brennen said he had lied in the police lineup; that the Commission "misrepresented" its own evidence, and that it "suppressed some"; that there was but a "shameful pretense" that Oswald's rights were looked after before the Commission (immediately followed by two examples, the failure to cross examine an obvious perjurer, accompanied by the explanation that prior to the testimony Oswald's "lawyer' had "indicated" the questions he wanted asked, and the case of the lawyer saying the record ought to show, before the fingerprint disappeared, that it had been identified as Oswald's). Now this book got an editorial endorsement from the executive editor three months ago. I have been waiting all this time for this niggling answer.

If this reaches youx before you speak to Collier, ask him, if he gives you his copy, if he'd like me to send him another. And I hope you can convince him that it will sell! I believe him, yet I have trouble believing this is his real reason.

Thanks for your call. Good luck.

Sincerely,